

REMARKS

On March 10, 2003, Applicant Attorney William Lightbody interviewed Examiner Seema Rau and Dang Ton relative to the September 13, 2002 office action.

The interview began with Lightbody discussing the NHK System (Tweedy col 2 lns 3-26), and how this system transmitted a series of still pictures with accompanying audio with the audio being digitally encoded and time division multiplexed on the frames being sent. Lightbody pointed out that this was a still picture system (pg 1 lns 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 17, 24, 27, 30, 33, 41, etc.). The sound signals are timed divisional multiplexed modulated on a video carrier of the television channel such that for any particular frame corresponding audio is also available.

The examiner's main Tweedy reference cites the NHK System as one which sends still pictures with accompanying sounds, with the video frames being selected for repetitive display while the corresponding analog audio is being played during reception (Tweedy col 2 lns 4-5, 19, 21). In discussing the NHK System, Tweedy indicates that the NHK System is not optimal for interactive broadband services wherein the user initiates and interacts with the program services at differing times.

The Tweedy device is an interactive telecommunication system (col 1 ln 35; col 8 lns 46-49). In Tweedy, a subscriber sends a request to a central facility (col 3 ln 4; col 4 lns 26, 45; col 7 lns 33-38; col 10 lns 11, 19, 32; etc.). In Tweedy, the requested information is then sent out addressed to the specific terminals requesting such information as set forth by the address in the request (col 3 lns 15-21; col 4 lns 43-52; col 7 lns 31-38; col 8 lns 29-32; col 10 lns 1-7, 11, 19, 31-32; etc.).

During the interview, Lightbody pointed out that both the Tweedy and the NHK System were analogous to slide shows, with the main difference between the two being that in Tweedy only requested information was being transmitted in interactive system while the NHK System was less discriminating sending still picture programs to all users simultaneously.

Lightbody then indicated in reference to claim 1 that the terminology "without a user specific request" was not true in Tweedy and that there was no recording of multiple programs in Tweedy at the user's location as the term is utilized in the present application claims. Tweedy has a video buffer to enable the maintenance of a single still image on a screen for an extended period of time as well as some sort of system to allow for the propagation of audio corresponding to the video during this same time period.

In respect to the Goldwasser patent, Lightbody showed that Goldwasser (figs 5, 6) used three microprocessor sequence controlled video tape recorders to allow for the complete viewing of a single program, which program might have been interrupted or otherwise subject to a time delay between recording and playback. Lightbody tracked the recording and playback sequencing of the individual decks in figure 6 with the recording and playback of machine 1 being offset between the recording and playback of machine 2 and 3 so as to provide for a single uninterrupted presentation of the program beginning "late" on a common single display device 85. Goldwasser notes that it would be impractically complicated for a user to operate three separately controlled conventional recorders in order to provide the functions provided by the Goldwasser invention (col 8 lns 28-31).

Lightbody further noted that due to the specific teachings of the Tweedy and Goldwasser references, it was not believed that they could be combined as suggested by the examiner. There is no incentive to do so. If there is a delay occasioned in Tweedy, the still screens can be requested at the later time, with no need to worry about any time shifting. Further, even if combined, the presently pending claims differentiate over any hindsight combination.

Specifically, in respect to the claims, applicant believes that Tweedy operates based on a user's request (see previous cites). In addition, applicant believes that the recording of two programs in a data storage medium, at the user's location also differentiates over Tweedy which uses buffers for a single frame of video and audio. This is not a program as in applicant's claims. Applicant presently does not believe that a one frame display buffer allowing for a single still image to remain visible or that the electronic processing of the audio information transforming from a video frame to a normal frequency can be said to store such programs. Further, ~~A~~ Tweedy does not select a program from a data storage medium at the user's location. To the contrary, it is believed that Tweedy requests the program be sent from a central facility which contains same (col 3 lns 3-4). Otherwise video information is not sent and the monitor presents "transparent" television (col 9 lns 33-35).

The remainder of the claims further differentiate over the examiner's cited Tweedy and Goldwasser art.

In respect to the "MPEG type" 112 objections, applicant pointed out that in claims 13 and 30 as originally claimed, the term "MPEG" is used (see also pg 49 lns 5, 22, 30; pg 50 ln 22; etc.). Offending term "type" has been removed.

In that the above response believes to overcome the examiner's objections and rejections, favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM LIGHTBODY
William S. Lightbody (29,557)